

**APR 18 2006**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

JOHN DOE; et al.,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

CLARK COUNTY BOARD OF  
EDUCATION; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 06-15120

D.C. No. CV-03-01500-LRH

MEMORANDUM<sup>\*</sup>

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Nevada  
Larry R. Hicks, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 13, 2006<sup>\*\*</sup>

Before: SILVERMAN, McKEOWN, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

---

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

This preliminary injunction appeal comes to us for review under Ninth Circuit Rule 3-3. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1), and we affirm.

We subject a district court's order regarding preliminary injunctive relief to limited review. *Walczak v. EPL Prolong, Inc.*, 198 F.3d 725, 730 (9th Cir. 1999). Our review of an order regarding a preliminary injunction "is much more limited than review of an order involving a permanent injunction, where all conclusions of law are freely reviewable." *Id.* A decision regarding a preliminary injunction is reviewed for abuse of discretion, which occurs only if the district court based its decision on either an erroneous legal standard or clearly erroneous factual findings. *Id.*

The district court did not abuse its discretion here. *See Martin v. Int'l Olympic Comm.*, 740 F.2d 670, 674-75 (9th Cir. 1984). We therefore affirm the district court's order denying plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction.

**AFFIRMED.**